

## REMARKS

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

The office action sets out a number of rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon a common combination of four references. These rejections will be discussed collectively and include the following:

- (1) Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 29-32, 37, 53 and 94-97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, Sordelet et al (6,242,108) or Darolia et al (6,749,951) in view of Thoma et al (4,895,625) and Foster et al (4,789,441).
- (2) Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, Sordelet et al (6,242,108) or Darolia et al (6,749,951) in view of Thoma et al (4,895,625) and Foster et al (4,789,441) as applied to claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 29-32, 37, 53 and 94-97 above, and further in view of Luch.
- (3) Claims 7, 8, 18-27, 33-36, 38-40, 50, 51, 55-57 and 68-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, Sordelet et al (6,242,108) or Darolia et al (6,749,951) in view of Thoma et al (4,895,625) and Foster et al (4,789,441) as applied to claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 29-32, 37, 53 and 94-97 above, and further in view of the Lowenheim text, *Electroplating*.
- (4) Claims 28, 41, 52, 58 and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, Sordelet et al (6,242,108) or Darolia et al (6,749,951) in view of Thoma et al (4,895,625) and Foster et al (4,789,441) as applied to claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 29-32, 37, 53 and 94-97 above, and further in view of Foster (5,833,829).

(5) Claims 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, Sordelet et al (6,242,108) or Darolia et al (6,749,951) in view of Thoma et al (4,895,625) and Foster et al (4,789,441) as applied to claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 29-32, 37, 53 and 94-97 above, and further in view of Oguto et al (5,792,333).

(6) Claims 59-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, Sordelet et al (6,242,108) or Darolia et al (6,749,951) in view of Thoma et al (4,895,625) and Foster et al (4,789,441) as applied to claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 29-32, 37, 53 and 94-97 above, and further view of Biner et al (5,851,317).

However, the office action also indicated that claims 44-49 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the limitation of claim 46 has been incorporated into independent claim 1 and claim 46 has been canceled.

Claim 47 has been amended to depend from claim 1.

Claim 32 has been amended so that  $\text{Al}_{70}\text{Cu}_{10}\text{Fe}_{10}\text{Cr}_{10}$  may be selected as the at least one quasicrystalline metal alloy.

Claims 38, 39, 50 and 51 have been canceled.

Claim 40 has been amended to depend from claim 47 and set out that the “target current density is between 2 and 100 mA/cm<sup>2</sup>.”

Claim 44 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1, 42 and 43.

New claim 100 depends from claim 9 and states that the quasicrystals include B, Si or combinations thereof.

Each of the remaining dependent claims now depends from an allowable claim. No new matter has been entered and no new issues have been raised.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the event there are additional charges in connection with the filing of this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account No. 50-0714/LYNN-0172 of the firm of the below-signed attorney in the amount of any necessary fee.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey L. Streets, #37,453/

---

Jeffrey L. Streets  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 37,453  
STREETS & STEELE  
13831 Northwest Freeway, Suite 355  
Houston, Texas 77040  
(713) 939-9444